Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully

requested in view of the above amendments and the discussion below.

Claim 7 has been objected to with respect to the expression "mechanical

angle" which has been deleted.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 13 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been

disclosed. It is indicated that the evidence of concealment is based upon the

reference to Tadahiro, the English abstract of Tadahiro, Applicants comments

and the claim. According to the statement of the rejection "the best mode has

been concealed in that with no distinguishing structural difference between

Applicants claimed and disclosed motor structure and that taught by Tadahiro,

Applicants' motor structure is capable of an operation (i.e., bi-directional

rotation) which Tadahiro is not".

Applicants traverse this rejection on the grounds that the best mode

contemplated by an inventor at the time of the invention is unknown unless

evidence by the inventor's own action or disclosed in the specification and

indicating as the best mode. The inventor would have to have a best mode and

not disclose it in the specification.

Page 5 of 7

Applicants submit that there is no evidence that there "was a best mode

known by the inventor" and that this "known best mode was missing from the

filed application".

Applicants submit that the reference to Tadahiro, plays no role in the

determination of either a best mode or an indication of concealment. There is no

evidence that there is some "best mode of operation" which is not disclosed in the

specification. Prior art does not provide evidence of a best mode of another

application. Additionally, if, as indicated by the rejection, Applicants structure is

capable of an operation which Tadahiro is not, this provides no evidence that

something was concealed.

Additionally, it is submitted that Applicants had previously argued that

the reference to Tadahiro has a teaching for "especially a rotor suitable in one

direction rotation". Therefore it may be theoretically possible that Tadahiro can

be reversed rotated but that was not the teaching to one of ordinary skill in the

art based on the combination of references for a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection which

has, as indicated in the present Office Action, been overcome.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this application containing

claims 5, 7, 9, 13 and 17 be allowed and be passed to issue.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Page 6 of 7

Serial No. 10/067,938

Amendment Dated: June 4, 2004

Reply to Office Action: March 4, 2004

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056203.49196DV).

Respectfully submitted,

June 4, 2004

Vincent J. Sunderdick Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group P.O. Box 14300 Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

VJS:adb